

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that that the rejections of the March 19, 2008 Office Action have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Summary of the Official Office Action

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al. (US 2002/0133573, hereinafter Matsuda).

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is allowable over the cited art, and an indication of allowability of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In lieu of the present amendment, Applicant has cancelled Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17 without prejudice and disclaimer and reserves the right to present them at a later time. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17 are now moot and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda

because of the present invention's limitations set forth below that are not disclosed in the reference.

In regard to amended Independent Claim 1, it recites, *inter alia*, . . . “generating a second internet protocol address according to the media access control address acquired, determining whether the internet protocol address acquired corresponds to the second internet protocol address generated, and sending a message preventing the device from using the internet protocol address when it is determined that the internet protocol address acquired corresponds to the second internet protocol address.” (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that Matsuda fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features of the present invention.

Reviewing Matsuda, it is seen to describe a method and apparatus for a dynamically configurable network where a first device on the network is initialized (Page 2, Paragraph 16). More specifically, “configuration information is requested from a second device upon connecting the first device to the network” (Page 2, Paragraph 16). This includes naming and addressing of the connected device where the connected device attempts to retrieve configuration information from a server (Figure 7; Page 7, Paragraph 65). In this process, the media access control (MAC) address of the connected device is acquired by the server and the internet protocol (IP) address of the connected device is obtained from it and checked to see if it is in use (Figure 7, Step 720; Page 6, Paragraph 65). Upon checking the IP address, if the IP address is already in use, the server will modify the IP address (Figure 7, Step 722; Page 6, Paragraph 65).

On the contrary, the present invention describes generating a second internet protocol address according to the MAC address of a connected device, determining whether the IP address acquired from the connected device corresponds to the second IP address generated, and sending a message preventing the device from using the internet protocol address when it is determined that the internet protocol address acquired corresponds to the second internet protocol address. Nothing in Matsuda is seen to disclose or mention at least these limitations as recited in Independent Claim 1.

Because Matsuda lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant respectfully submits that Matsuda fails to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and that the office action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejection of at least independent Claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 are directed to an apparatus and computer-readable storage medium storing process steps for limiting the use of an IP address and/or limiting data transfer and were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 are applicable to Claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 depend from at least one of allowable base Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 or 16. As such, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least for the reason that each of these claims depend from allowable base Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 and recite additional features that further

define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number **502456**.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at (949) 932-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

06/19/2008

/Sivon Kalminov/

Date

Sivon Kalminov, Reg. No. 40,042
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560